

337.3
B318sp
Lincoln Room

SPEECH OF MR. I. C. BATES, OF MASSACHUSETTS, IN DEFENCE OF THE PROTECTIVE SYSTEM.

DELIVERED IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, FEBRUARY 21, 1844.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It has become necessary that I should address the Senate upon the subject of the Protective system; and I may as well do it upon this occasion as upon any other, as my purpose is to present the system to the Senate and to the country in the light in which I view it, and to obviate some objections which have been urged against it. But as Massachusetts has received particular attention from one Senator and another, (Messrs. McDUFFIE and WOODBURY,) it would be deemed a discourtesy in me if I did not, in her behalf, at least make my poor respects to them, which may better be done now than at a more advanced stage of the debate.

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. WOODBURY) could not conclude his elaborate, and, I must be permitted to say, very deceptive and delusive speech, although unintentionally, without a formal warning to the Senate, obviously designed as a reproof to the Legislature and people of Massachusetts. I have pleasure in assuring the honorable Senator it will have all the effect upon them it deserves to have. The Senator took occasion to announce to the Senate, not in very good taste as I thought, that "the people of New Hampshire are patriotic, energetic, and enterprising; and that they shed their blood in defence of the country during the late war." To this, as a matter of *fact*, I have nothing to say, other than that it has no connexion with the subject before the Senate. But if the Senator intended thereby an implication, that the people of Massachusetts did not shed *their* blood in defence of the country, then I have to inform the Senate, that while New Hampshire, numbering each of her soldiers by the times he was called into service, furnished of militia during the war, less than five thousand men, Massachusetts furnished, computed by the same rule, more than thirty-eight thousand. Massachusetts defended a seaboard of six hundred miles exposure, menaced at every point, and assailed at every assailable point, while New Hampshire defended a seaboard of only ten or fifteen miles in extent, and which, so far as I remember, was not assailed at all. Her whole exposure was only that of the muzzle of a gun in the embrasure of a fortress, Massachusetts and Maine constituting the solid defences upon both sides. Nor ought it, upon this occasion, to be forgotten whose sailors they were that fought the battle with the *Guerriere*, and threw the first gleam of light upon the dark cloud that overshadowed us; nor whose sailors they were that fought the battle of *Macdonough*, on Lake Champlain; nor whose sailors they were that shared in every other naval battle during the progress of the war. But if the honorable Senator only intended to refer to a difference of opinion that had existed between the Governor of Massachusetts and the President of the United States, upon a question of State rights, I will only say I do not highly appreciate the motive that induced it, nor the honor resulting from it. Caleb Strong is now no more. His fame is beyond the reach of any man to injure. He was a Senator of the United States in the time of

Washington. For many years he was Governor of Massachusetts. It was my happiness to live near him as a neighbor. A purer, better, I might almost say an abler man, I have never known.

The Senator from South Carolina, (Mr. McDUFFIE,) passing over all the intermediate States deeply interested in the protective system, and extensively engaged in manufacturing—not noticing Pennsylvania, New York, nor Connecticut—knocked very loudly, not to say rudely, at our door in Massachusetts, and denounced us as robbers—plunderers; told us we had got his money, and were living upon the fruits of his earning. Mr. President, we have but little—nothing to boast of. The little we have, we have dug up out of the hard earth by the labor of our hands and in the sweat of our brow, or we have fished it up out of the stormy sea, or our women and children have earned it by the light of the lamp, or our mechanics in the workshop, or our sailors from zone to zone, the world over. What we have may fairly be accounted for by our habits of industry and economy. We have not enough to excite suspicion of dishonest practices, much less to justify an honorable Senator! a Senator of South Carolina! here, in the Senate of the United States, and in the face of the world, in making such a charge against us.

But if we have his money—*his money!*—how did we obtain it? He says we got it by the instrumentality of the protective system, which he characterizes as an “infernal system,” as a “monster.” Now, sir, whether it had an infernal or supernal origin, whether it be a monster or not, the Senator can best tell. So far as it respects the legislation of this century in reference to this subject, the system had its origin in South Carolina. If a monster, it crawled out of a stagnant pool in South Carolina. It has the palmetto stamp upon it ineffaceably. It was burned into its shell and bone in 1816. The act of that year imposed a duty of 20 per cent. ad valorem on cotton manufactures; but it provided that the square yard, costing, with the addition of 20 per cent., if imported from the Cape of Good Hope, or places beyond the cape, less than 25 cents, should, with such addition, be taken and deemed to have cost 25 cents, and should be charged with a duty of 20 per cent. accordingly. Passing over an intermediate act, which continued the act of 1816 in force until 1826, the act of 1824 raised the minimum valuation of the square yard from 25 to 30 cents, and the duty to be assessed upon it from 20 to 25 per cent.

The minimum valuation of the square yard of cotton cloth in the act of 1816, is the *punctum saliens*, and germinating principle of the protective system of which the honorable Senator complains. It was planted there, I understand, by a then distinguished member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina, and the immediate predecessor of the honorable Senator. It imposed an average duty of 75 per cent. upon India cottons, and it had the effect to exclude the coarse article from Calcutta, and to substitute our own more valuable and cheap cotton fabric in its stead.

The act of 1824 was not only passed without the consent but against the earnest remonstrance of Massachusetts. Only one of her twelve members of the House voted for it; the other eleven, with both her Senators, voting against it.

How was it with the act of 1828, which Senators have denominated an act of abominations? Who made that act what it was? The act of 1824 was considered as settling the policy of the Government, the capi-

tal and business of the country conformed. But it turned out that a reduction of the impost duty upon wool into England about that time had taken away no inconsiderable share of the protection which the act of 1824 was designed to afford. And in 1826, being exceedingly oppressed by importations from abroad and other causes, the woollen manufacturers applied to Congress to afford them, under the thus changed circumstances, at least the full benefit which, by the act of 1824, was intended for them. A paternal Government would have done this forthwith. But, sir, it became convenient to make the protective system an instrument, or at least a test, of party. A committee, adverse to the specific claims of the petitioners, in January, 1828, reported a bill imposing, for example, a duty on molasses of 10 cents a gallon, on sail duck of 9 cents the square yard, and like extravagant duties upon some other articles, pressing heavily upon the Eastern States. This act of 1828 was made what it is by Southern votes. If there be an *abominable* feature in it, that feature was fixed in it by Southern votes. A motion was made to except "ravens duck" from the duty of 9 cents the square yard. The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. McDUFFIE) voted against it. A motion was made to strike from the bill the duty of 10 cents a gallon on molasses, and leave it under the act of 1824, subject to a duty of 5 cents. The Senator from South Carolina, (Mr. McDUFFIE,) voted against it. A motion was made to reduce it from 10 to 7 cents. The Senator from South Carolina, with other Southern gentlemen, voted against it. I repeat, sir, every feature of abomination in that bill, in my belief, would have been changed but for Southern votes. And when the bill passed the House, Massachusetts gave eleven votes against it, and but two for it.

Now, Mr. President, does it not mount up to the supreme of assurance in the honorable Senator, to denounce the *people of Massachusetts* as "robbers and plunderers" by the agency of an "infernal system" of protecting duties?—a system which was thus originated?—a system which was thus imposed upon the State of Massachusetts? Let the Senate judge, let the country judge, let the world judge, between us.

But, Mr. President, if the Senate will pardon me, in 1824 I differed in opinion from many, indeed most of my fellow-citizens in Massachusetts, upon the subject of a protective tariff. Peace having been restored to Europe, and the people having been remitted to their accustomed occupations and pursuits upon the land and upon the water, our harvest of the carrying trade for other nations having some years before that time come to an end, I saw, or thought I saw, no other way to retain our population but by enlarging the basis of our industry, and creating a home demand and a home market. The public roads were thronged with emigrants westward. Families were going, capital was going, our young men, the best of all capital, were going. The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. WOODBURY) speaks of ploughing up our mountains to their summits, and of draining our swamps, and beautifying New England, in a condition of free trade. Sir, with the exception of some favored positions upon the rivers or elsewhere, and some land upon the seaboard, which might serve to dry fish upon, there is not a farm in New Hampshire or Massachusetts which, in such a state of things, I would take as a gift, and be *obliged to cultivate it*. So far from draining our swamps, and terracing our mountain slopes, sir, there

would not be people enough left to tell a traveller where he could find them. How could New England, without a market, think of an agricultural competition with the great West? Whether any of the Atlantic States of the South are in the same condition now we were in then, they best know.

Having disposed of these preliminary matters, my purpose is now, Mr. President, to vindicate the system; and I ask the attention of the Senate to the subject, which, however much it may have been talked about, has been generally but very imperfectly understood. And I begin, sir, by asking your attention to the philosophy of the system, if I may use a word of such lofty import.

Labor, it is now universally agreed, is the source of all wealth, as well as the measure of all *money* values. That which costs no labor has no price. Light, air, water, have no price, unless labor in some form be connected with them. An eagle is valued at ten dollars, because the labor to obtain the ore and make the coin is worth ten dollars. It follows, then, that a nation, as well as an individual, to be rich, must be industrious, must work; not merely a few field hands in the fair weather of summer, but old men, infirm men, men, women, and children, in the winter as well as in the summer, in foul as well as in fair weather, by the light of the lamp as well as by the light of the sun, must work. The whole physical ability of a nation must be called forth into efficient action, aided by the facilities which the elements and the mechanic arts afford, by the wonderful dexterity which a partition of labor imparts, and by the all-powerful and ever active energy which the prospect of a sure and liberal reward applies, all guided and directed by experienced, skilful, and master minds. The basis of industry, therefore, must be made broad and diversified, so as to be suited to the age, the capacity, the infirmities, the condition of all. Here, Mr. President, lies the unfailing, the exhaustless mine of national wealth. It is the only mine that is worth working. It is the mine in which the statesman will work, in which the patriot will work, in which the Christian will work, in which all men will work, unless politicians constitute an exception.

Now, sir, beyond very restricted limits, it is obvious the basis of industry cannot be thus enlarged and diversified without capital. Those who own the capital will not invest it without a reasonable prospect of reward. That cannot be afforded unless a market is provided for the products of capital; and a market cannot be provided without protection.

But, Mr. President, you will say all this is true, while manufactures are in their infancy, while the plants are taking root; but after they have become established, after they have grown up to maturity, why is further protection needed? I will tell you, sir. It is necessary to give *security, stability, and safety*, to business. In the daytime you walk with a firm, quick, confident step; in the dark, with a slow, doubtful, timid step. Such is the difference in the march of business, when a market is certain and when it is contingent. This subject was well illustrated by my friend from Maine, (Mr. EVANS) in the effect of surplus upon price, and in the advantage of large capital and low interest, over a small capital with high interest. I will suppose Texas exceeded the South in the production of cotton as much as England

exceeds the North in manufactures, and that Texas was as dependent as England now is upon her colonies and what not, for a market; and the South as dependent as the North now is upon the home market. The market of Texas, for her cotton, would be liable to be interrupted by a thousand contingencies—by war, by over production, by revulsions in business. She might be influenced by agricultural rivalry. Nations are selfish. Would it be *safe* for the South, I ask, to take off the three cents duty upon cotton? Would it be *wise* to do it? Would you plant with the same confidence then as you now do? Would you plant as much? Would you make large outlays in planting? Nay, I might almost ask, would you plant at all? Over 5,000,000 pounds of cotton were imported into the United States from Texas in 1842. Suppose the market of the South was as limited as that of the North, what would have been the effect of that surplus importation upon the planting interest?

The agricultural products are all now amply protected by the act of August 30, 1842. The duties are as follows: On hemp, \$40 a ton; on flax, \$20 a ton; on beef and pork, 2 cents a pound; on bacon, 3 cents a pound; on cheese 9 cents, on butter 5, and on lard 3 cents a pound; on wheat, 25 cents a bushel; on barley 20, rye 15, oats 10, and corn 10 cents a bushel; on potatoes, 10 cents a bushel; on wheat flour, 70 cents per 112 pounds; on wool costing over 7 cents a pound at the place whence exported to the United States, 3 cents a pound, and 30 per cent. ad valorem; and on cotton, 3 cents a pound. Lead and sugar are not strictly the products of agriculture, but the duty on lead is 3 cents a pound, on raw sugar $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents, and on other sugar 4 cents a pound.

The *importation* of agricultural products in the year ending the 30th of September, 1842, the tariff act of that year having become a law in August preceding, were as follows: Oats, 55,778 bushels; wheat, 4,082 bushels; potatoes, 86,638 bushels; cheese, 77,124 pounds; butter, 5,740 pounds; bacon, 59,384 pounds; beef and pork, 186,973 pounds; and cotton, 5,340,320 pounds.

Now, sir, I ask, would it be *safe* for the *farmers* to repeal these protective duties, and admit the agricultural products of other nations? The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. WOODBURY) says these duties are useless; moreover, that they were designed to *hoodwink* and *delude* the farmers. No such thing, Mr. President. The Senator is mistaken. The importations of 1842 were a dead loss to the farming interest to the amount of the equivalents it could have furnished in their stead, and to the country, in addition, the amount paid to the foreigner. What breadstuffs might not come from the Black sea, and the interior of Europe, and from South America? What wool, what beef and pork, butter and cheese, might not come? It is enough to say we want none of these things; and, therefore, it is wise to put a check to the importation of them; much wiser, still, to put an end to it.

Let me, in illustration, bring to the notice of the Senate the article of coarse cottons. And I might as well take hats, boots, shoes, cutlery, bonnets, buttons, or almost any protected article. We can in the article of coarse cottons compete with England in the market of the world. We do it; and yet a repeal of the protective duty would essentially injure, if not destroy, this branch of business. Were England to admit our coarse cottons into her market freely, I do not hesitate to say that, with our limited means, if we could not stop, we could strangely de-

range her spindles. When a vessel is full, a drop makes it run over. Our cottons admitted into the English market, would be felt in every poor man's dinner in Manchester.

We need protection, therefore, in the infancy of manufactures, that they may take root; and in their maturity we need it for safety, for security, for stability. We want it as we want a sea-wall, not that such a barrier is of any use when the sea is tranquil, but of great use when it is in commotion; as the man of war wants a shield, which is of no use to him when he is not assailed, but of great use when he is.

And, Mr. President, allow me to ask, what *injury* results from this *continued* protection? So far from it, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. WOODBURY) says it is nugatory and useless. Not so. But, what injury does the three cents duty upon cottons produce? or the high duty upon wheat, &c.? or the duty upon coarse cottons? None. Then, why should they be abrogated? On the contrary, I maintain that they are essential to your *safety*; and that without them your country will be little better than a common field without the camp of nations, into which their sweepings, their offscourings, all their redundancies will be thrown; and the auction system in the States is a very convenient absorbent of the whole mass.

I say, then, in vindication of the protective system, that it is *necessary*, first, to call into efficient action the moral and physical, the dormant and otherwise useless energies of the country; and, secondly, to keep them in action by carefully providing for their safety.

Mr. President, I will now briefly allude to some of the general bearings of the system. And, first, upon the capitalists. I am not going into details. I have lived in the midst of cotton and woollen manufacturers. I have seen their rise, their progress, and in many instances their fall. I have pretty ample means of knowledge. I give it to the Senate as my deliberate opinion, which I am willing should go to the country, and upon which I am content to stake myself before the people of the United States—many of whom know well how this matter is—that the capital invested in cotton manufactures since 1824 has not netted six per cent. interest; and that the capital invested in woollen manufactures has not netted three per cent. A citizen of Massachusetts, formerly a member of the House of Representatives, entitled to the most entire confidence, states that there are nine establishments at Lowell manufacturing cotton, with an aggregate capital of nine million five hundred thousand dollars. The amount of their semi-annual dividends for the last two years, up to the present month of February, is \$1,095,000, being less than six per cent. per annum, and would have been considerably less, had the companies actually reserved ten per cent. per annum for the wear and tear of machinery, as assumed by Mr. McDUFFIE! Yet, sir, these capitalists are the men who, whenever this protective system comes under consideration here, which is usually preliminary to a Presidential election, are treated as if they were pick-pockets, denounced as petitioners for bounty!—the bounty of the South!—as “clamoring” at the door of the Senate! Mr. President, whose door is that? Is it the Senator's from New Hampshire? or the Senator's from South Carolina? I thought it was the door of the PEOPLE. I thought it was a door to which they had a right to come with their

petitions. But I do not believe one of these men has approached you, or your door, since 1828; or will ever approach either again.

Whence the benefit of the system, then, you will ask? I answer, in its immense and diffusive results. I might begin by saying:

In the construction of the factories, and villages that attend them;

In the employment of thousands of operatives within the precincts of the factories, not a few men, as the Senator from New Hampshire says, detached from the farm and the workshop;

In the employment the system gives to the idle hours of women and children in the country, in braiding straw, and chip, and palm-leaf, and in making bonnets and hats, and giving the finish to many other things which machinery and the more clumsy workmanship of men cannot give. Why, sir, in the town adjoining that in which I live, tons of buttons are sent to market monthly, I think I might say weekly, which give employment to farmers' daughters for many miles around. Go through the country in a pleasant afternoon of summer, the household work being done, you will see them at the window, or upon the terrace, or clustered under the shade of the family butternut or elm. The bees are not more busy than they are;

Again, in the employment the protective system gives to mechanics, machinists, artisans, superintendents, agents, clerks, porters, &c.;

In forcing into action the powers of water, steam, and the mechanic arts—waking these sleeping giants and setting them to work, whereby the girl that drew one thread upon her great household wheel can in the same time draw an hundred threads;

In the creation it makes of new agricultural products, such as woad, teasles, &c.;

And in the new demand it makes for those which were before in use, not merely in the vicinage, as the Senator from South Carolina supposes, but throughout the United States. Take wool for an example. How immense the agricultural interest in this! and how universal! and yet, there is not a shepherd's boy who carries a crook so stupid as not to know that any protection of it is of no use, unless the woollen manufacture is protected, to give him a market. So it is with hemp. Take cotton, three or four hundred thousand bales of which are demanded for the home supply. Instance the sugar of Louisiana, by which that rich alluvial region is diverted from the growth of cotton, and by which the price of slave labor and slave property is enhanced throughout the South. Six hundred thousand barrels of flour, it is said, were imported into Boston the last year—worth more than \$3,000,000. And this is not all. The depôts along the Western railroad supply the interior for many miles upon the right and left of it. Flour comes to us from all the grain-growing States—some from Ohio and Michigan. That diminishes the supply there, and makes way for the flour further west, and thence westward still, to our extreme western limits. It is as the water which flows out of the mouth of the Mississippi, making way for that which follows from the mouth to the source; and as of the whole, so of each successive drop. Mr. President, there is not a spindle that turns at the North, that does not benefit the South; nor a plant of cotton, nor a blade of cane, that is grown at the South, that does not benefit the North. This mutuality of interest is the connecting link and the attractive power which unites us in a social state, and should unite us in

social harmony. Moreover, Boston furnishes a market for a much larger quantity of Indian corn than it does for wheat flour. I need not advert to the demand which the protective system creates for tobacco, rice, beef, pork, potatoes, hams—for every thing that is consumable.

The tariff of 1842 has been referred to in illustration of the benefits of the protective system. When that act was passed, the *labor* of this country was dead. But as soon as it was passed, never did a race horse start upon his course more eagerly or more fiercely than did the labor of this country upon its course. And now the Senators from South Carolina and New Hampshire would arrest it midway, without notice, suddenly, that they may readjust some strap or buckle in its harness. The *credit* of the country, too, was dead. You had no credit abroad. You had none at home. Your stock was below par. The six per cent. stock of the United States below par in your own market. That act alone resuscitated it. Your stock is now fifteen or eighteen per ct. above par.

Sir, the moral influence of the system is beneficial. Labor, regular habits of labor, are the best preventives of vice, especially in the young, and the best guardians of virtue. There is nothing inherent in the system that is in any respect injurious to morals. In Massachusetts, no child under fifteen years of age, can be employed in a factory that does not attend school three months out of twelve in each year. The factories, as they are conducted, are places of refuge, of comfort, of numberless blessings, to the poor. They may not be the most favorable to physical development. Nor is the life of a student so favorable as that of a farmer; nor the life of a farmer as that of the savage.

The effect of the system upon the commerce and navigation of the country is beneficial. There is a woollen factory in Northampton, one of the oldest in the country, the transportation business of which used mainly to pass by my door. One wagon would suffice to carry its bales of broadcloth to market, when many wagons were required to convey to the factory the materials consumed in the process of making the cloth. The one is the freight of navigation without the protective system; the other is, to a great extent, the freight of navigation with it.

But the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. WOODBURY) is of a different opinion, and he spoke with great zeal on the subject. He said, "He hoped the Senate would excuse him if he spoke more strongly on the subject of our navigation interest than on any other. It would be recollected that this was a subject in which his State was deeply interested; a large portion of the business and interests of the State was on the ocean. The people of New Hampshire are patriotic, energetic, and enterprising. They shed their blood in defence of their country during the late war. They did not want their interests to be prostrated. All they expected was equality of legislation—an open sea, flowing sail, and a fair fight, is all they ever asked." He added, "The blow which the protective system strikes at navigation is far more disastrous, in a national point of view, than the protective system can be beneficial." Now, Mr. President, I wish to detract a little, if I can, from the power that gave the honorable Senator such an impulse, and seemed to impart to him such a momentum. In 1842, the tonnage of Maine was 291,925 tons; of Massachusetts, 474,889; New Hampshire had 23,921 tons! The imports of Maine were \$606,000; of Massachusetts, \$17,986,000; the imports of New Hampshire were \$60,481! The ex-

ports of Maine were \$1,050,000 ; of Massachusetts, \$9,807,000 ; the exports of New Hampshire were \$28,547 ! and they were in an improving condition, for in 1841 they were only \$10,348 ! all told. The crews of New Hampshire that cleared out in 1842 were fifty-six men and three boys ! Now, Mr. President, a friend has suggested, if navigation be the *great* interest of New Hampshire, what, in the name of all the decimals, must her other interests be ? I advert to the "navigation interest" of New Hampshire only because the Senator invoked it as his inspiring muse, as that which was going to make him speak more "strongly" on this subject than on any other. And he did speak more strongly—and what did he say ? He said that the act of 1842 imposes a tax upon navigation of five dollars a ton. If the effect of the act was to raise the price of the articles consumed in ship building the amount of the duty, I am assured his estimate is too high. But such is not the effect. His calculation, therefore, need not excite alarm.

Again, he says, taking for his illustration the 15,000 tons of shipping in Portsmouth engaged in foreign commerce, in order, I suppose, to impress the people of Portsmouth more deeply with a sense of their wrongs, that this tonnage will need renewing once in five years. I have been told it will not need it once in ten years. The Senator says that this will amount to an annual tax upon that town of \$15,000, or about \$2 a head upon its inhabitants. Well, sir, if Portsmouth has to pay annually a dollar a ton upon her shipping, the United States must pay at the same rate. The tonnage of the United States, in 1842, was 2,092,390 tons. The sum, therefore, to be paid annually by the United States, is \$2,092,390. But, taking the average of the tonnage built in the last six years, it amounts only to 120,566 tons ; and admit that the act of 1842 augments the cost \$5 a ton, it only amounts to \$602,830, instead of \$2,092,390.

But the Senator says the protective system cuts off the long voyage. The 400,000 bales of cotton now sent to Boston, Providence, and elsewhere, would otherwise be shipped to Liverpool and Havre. Mr. President, it is the first time I ever heard it said there was any particular advantage in being obliged to go a great way to market, or to mill. But what is navigation ? It is to the country what a farmer's wagon is to his farm—an instrument by which he conveys his surplus produce to market, and brings back its returns. Navigation is but a continuation of the same journey by other agencies. Now, the honorable Senator says, a blow at navigation is more injurious to the nation than the protective system can be beneficial ; that is, a blow at the wagon is more injurious than the protection of the farm can be beneficial. I do not think so. The wagon, let it be remembered, is a *market* wagon. The best way to patronize even the wagon is to protect the farm, the labor upon the farm, the workshop, the mines—to make all as productive as possible. But admit, what is undoubtedly true, that a long journey costs more than a short one, that the transportation from New Orleans to Liverpool would cost more money than from New Orleans to Providence or Boston. What does that show ? No particular advantage to the *country*, certainly. If anything, only an advantage to the navigating interest. This was the point of the Senator's argument. Is he right in this ? Under the reciprocity treaties, from one-third to one-half the freight from New Orleans to Liverpool or Havre will be taken by foreign

bottoms. The coasting trade is exclusively our own. From the 400,000 bales of cotton manufactured into cloth in the United States, an immense commercial business springs up coastwise. Not only coastwise, but portions of the same bales of cotton, in the form of cotton cloth, give freight to Honduras, to Brazil, round Cape Horn to Chili, and round the Cape of Good Hope to China. Yet the Senator, as the particular friend and advocate of navigation, advises the surrender, the annihilation of this coasting trade and home business, so far as relates to cotton, for the *chance* of freight to Liverpool and Havre. This is sacrificing not merely the farm to the wagon, but the farm and the wagon both. Commerce and navigation depend upon the *subjects* of commerce; and these, again, depend upon the productive industry of the people, to which the protective system is so eminently subsidiary.

But the honorable Senator kindles into a flame of admiration at the results of the dispersed condition of British territory. Her commercial marine and her military marine, he says, "are her boast and her glory; and our maritime States are compelled, by partial legislation, to neglect the like great advantages which their position so much favors, and which, the Senator says, it would be our best policy to encourage." The Senator has only to detach these States from each other, and to dot the world over with them—to belt it with them so that the sun, in his language, shall never set upon some of them—or rather, as I think, so that it would soon set forever on all of them—and he will realize the advantages he dreams of. We should then have abundant occasion for ships, and for a military marine. Great Britain makes the best of her condition. The Senator seems to covet the very *evils* from which ours exempts us. For myself, I am quite content with our position as it is, in a compact form. Washed by two oceans, we have "sea room" enough; and we have no need of a marine, military or otherwise, but to freight our commerce and defend our country as it is.

Mr. President, the protective system, in my belief, is, in all its bearings, beneficial to the whole country; as beneficial to the South as to the North; prejudicial to no part of it. The rays of it may fall less directly upon some sections than upon others, but they fall beneficently upon all.

With the indulgence of the Senate, I will now proceed to consider some objections. The protective system, it is said, augments the price of the protected articles to the consumer. The fact is notorious, standing out as prominently as the Allegany mountains in the sunlight, that you buy them cheaper than you ever did before. But, it is said, this is in spite, and not by the aid, or as a consequence, of the protective system. I know very well that the seasons, peace, war, the currency, and almost every thing else, act upon price. But experience has developed and demonstrated the great law to which my friend from Maine (Mr. EVANS) alluded, "THAT PRICE IS GOVERNED BY SUPPLY AND DEMAND." Supply, again, on the one hand, depends upon the various causes to which I have referred. Demand, on the other, depends upon the *wants* of the people, connected with their *ability* to buy. If there be no *ability* to buy, their wants have no effect upon demand. The ability of the people to buy, again, depends upon their labor, their employment, their wages, high or low, profitable or otherwise. Now, let us apply this law to the protective system. You impose a high duty upon a given article. If it check the importation of it, it will raise the

price, because it will lessen the supply, the demand continuing equal. But if it have the further effect to produce an equivalent supply of the same or a similar article in the country, it will have no effect upon *price*. The supply will be the same. But if it have a still further effect to produce in the country *more* than an equivalent supply, it will reduce the price, because it will increase the supply. This is the operation of the protective system. It answers the free trade inquiry, how it can be that high duties make low prices. And the effect of the system has been, with regard to most of the protected articles, while it checked importation on the one hand, to produce on the other more than an equivalent supply. It will be so with regard to all such articles as our country has the means of immediately bringing into market. But, if a duty were put, for instance, upon oranges, it would check importation, and would probably raise the price of them. It certainly would, if the orange groves are not in a condition immediately to yield an equivalent supply, unless there are other causes acting to diminish the price abroad. But as soon as the planters could grow the trees and supply the market, the price would fall, and most likely below what it was before the duty was imposed. The tendency is to over production, in our country particularly. A duty on cordage and sail cloth would at first raise the price of these articles, if the condition of the country, of the hemp grower, and the manufacturer, was not such as immediately to furnish a supply. But, whenever it should become so, the duty would have no effect upon price, except to reduce it. Now, the *fact* that the market is full of the protected articles is not only known to all, but the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. WOODBURY) admitted it in his speech. "Even now," he said, "the stimulus to over production *keeps a surplus on hand*; and it goes on increasing, with a tendency to break up the manufacturers." Thus he yielded the point upon which the whole question turns, as the Senator from South Carolina yielded the principle upon which his opposition rests, when he said, you may discriminate in favor of the poor, and in favor of navigation. Whatever other causes may have contributed to the result, the fact is undoubted, that the protective system, instead of augmenting, has reduced the price of protected articles to the consumer. They are bought now, in my opinion, much cheaper than they will be when our market comes to be yielded up to foreigners, if that event, which seems to be so much desired by some gentlemen, should ever happen.

But it is asked, as if admitting of no answer, if protection does not raise prices, why do you want it? Sir, we want it, as I have said before, to give occupation to labor, to give occupation to land and labor. We want it continued to give security, and permanence and stability, to both. We want it, not that the laborer shall get double wages, but that he shall *get work* at single wages. We want it as you want a fence about your field, not that it makes the wheat grow taller or heavier, but that, when you sow it, you may have some reasonable prospect of being able to reap it. Sir, you will not be likely to throw away your seed, nor to expend your labor, when it is otherwise.

But, Mr. President, if the effect of the system *was* to raise prices, does it not return you a thousand fold more than an equivalent, in the *improved* market it gives you; in the *secure* market it gives you—a home market; and in the national independence it establishes for you? No nation can

call itself independent that relies upon a foreign supply either of the means of subsistence or of defence. It is at best but a tenant at the will of others. But, as more appropriate to this mere money objection, does not the protective system give you more than an equivalent for any imagined advance of price it makes, in the national wealth it creates, as exhibited in the general thrift of the people, and in the national strength it gives?

There is a sophism, Mr. President, which has been used with great effect against the protective system, which I wish to expose. It may be called the free trade syllogism. "It is best to buy where you can buy cheapest. You can buy abroad cheaper than you can at home. Therefore, it is best to buy abroad." I deny the truth of the major proposition. Under certain circumstances, it is true: but, in application to the subject in hand, there is nothing in the Alcoran more false than it is. Price is not the only thing to be considered in making a purchase, nor the chief thing. The first and most important consideration is, of whom to buy—a member of your own family, of your own neighborhood or town, of a countryman in whom you have some interest, or of a foreigner in whom you have less. The next consideration which was forcibly illustrated by my friend from Maine, is the mode of payment; and last, and least, is the price. The predecessor of the Senator from South Carolina, discussing the subject of the tariff, told the Senate, that a friend of his returning from abroad, informed him that prices were much lower there than in the United States. The coat that cost him say but \$20 there, would have cost \$30 here. Now, I say, that the coat cost the country \$50, instead of \$20. The American farmer, manufacturer, and tailor, lost \$30, while the price paid was \$20. Let me push the illustration further, and the truth will show itself. If it were best for the Senator's friend to do this, then, Mr. President, it is best for you, for me, for all the people, to do likewise. If it is best thus to buy our coats, then to buy our hats, boots, shoes—all our clothing. If our clothing, then our furniture, and whatsoever else we can buy cheaper out of the country than we can buy in it. What will be the effect? Our own people, who had the materials and skill to supply these various articles, are thrown out of employment. Do you say, not so? Let them do something else. The answer is, they cannot. They have their trades. They have their establishments, which they cannot afford to sacrifice. Moreover, what else shall they do? If they are thrown upon the farming or planting interests, both are overstocked now. The more they produce, the less they will get. Time is money. I repeat, sir, the coat cost the country much more than the \$20 paid for it. And, Mr. President, let me say, by the bye, that henceforward no man will be a President of the United States, nor a Vice President, who does not wear an American coat, body, cape, lining, pockets, buttons, American throughout, and not occasionally but habitually. It fits better, and looks better, and is better.

Perhaps, sir, there may be some young man, or old gentleman, within the hearing of my voice, whose clothes, while he has been waiting upon Congress to have his claim adjusted, begin to grow rusty; and he may want a new hat. He goes to the shops, and he can buy one for \$4 cash, or one of the same kind for \$5, and pay in his work. The hatter wants his books posted, and the bills made out for his customers, and will allow him the customary price for his services in doing it. I need not ask you, if he be a sensible young man, which hat he will take. It costs him nothing. Better than that; while he is paying for it, he is kept from evil. But if he

could readily elsewhere first convert his labor into money, then the case would occur in which the proposition would be true: "It is best to buy where you can buy cheapest." *Ceteris paribus*, all other things being equal, the article being the product of home labor, and the mode of payment equally facile, *then* buy where you can buy cheapest.

The unsoundness of the theory, that the producer of the exports pays the impost duties, has been sufficiently exposed by the honorable Senators who have gone before me, (Mr. EVANS, Mr. HUNTINGTON, and Mr. PHELPS;) as if the temperance man, who froze and exported his ice, paid the duty on his neighbor's glass of brandy; or the farmer in Ohio, who exported a barrel of flour, paid any more duty than he who made another barrel, and consumed it in his family. I buy a bale of cotton of the Senator from South Carolina, and pay him for it. It becomes the representative of my labor then, not of his. What I pay becomes the representative of his labor, not of mine. His interest in the bale of cotton is thenceforward common to that of every other citizen of the United States.

But suppose his circle of free trade to be established, is it not apparent that an arc of the circle would soon be wanting. Necessity is a sterner law than any you can pass. The people, thrown out of employment, would be unable to purchase the return cargoes of foreign goods. At that point *demand* would cease. The Senator thinks otherwise. But, in my judgment, he might as well attempt to replace a segment in the orb of Jupiter, if it were missing, as to get a home market for his goods by any other means than resorting to the system which he now denounces.

And, sir, let me ask, is it not very well for the cotton as it is? Is there any better business now than planting cotton? If there be, whence comes it to pass, that the South does not go into it?

The Senator from South Carolina inquired, supposing the United States to be a baronial estate, whether any man would be so demented as to destroy the cotton crop? Certainly not. But let me follow this baronial estate further, and imagine the honorable Senator to be the owner of it. What would he do? Sir, first of all, he would fall upon his knees, and thank his Maker that he had given him such a rich, broad, and more than princely or imperial domain, with such a variety of soil and climate, with such an immense diversity, without the least conflict of interest. He would then turn his attention anxiously and devotedly to the happiness of the millions of his people. He would first give them all occupation as a source of wealth to himself, and as a security against vice, and a nursery of virtue to them. He would then plant school houses all over his domain, with good, educated, religious teachers in them, that his *people*, I will not imagine them *vassals*, might learn their duty, and their destiny. If he had any surplus products, he would export them. And what, sir, would he bring back in return? The things that his people could make as well as not at home; and which if they did not make, they would be idle? No, sir. No, sir. No such thing. If he delighted to please his people and see them happy, he would bring the comforts, and perhaps the luxuries which they could not furnish. The residue, if such there was, he would bring back in money. With this, he would make roads and canals, clear out rivers and harbors, make harbors if necessary to save the lives of his people. He would accommodate all parts of his domain by facilities of intercommunication; and if he had the means, he would embellish and garnish it, and clothe it in beauty.

This, sir, is what the Senator would do. He would not give up his cotton patch ; but he would not sacrifice twelve millions of his people to it.

Mr. President, there is one other consideration of grave moment, in my estimation, which I wish to present to the Senate. Senators seem to forget under what form of government we live ; by what means this republican structure of ours is to be supported ; what the people must be ; what the character of the people must be ; and upon what that character depends. The power of steam, it has been said, has bridged over the Atlantic. It has brought us into close proximity to other nations. Now, sir, let the jubilee of free trade begin. Throw open your ports and markets, and beckon the nations hither. Let the people of every tribe, kindred, and tongue, come with their motley products. As I have often said before, and as I think most truly, the people of the United States, standing side by side in the same market place, on the same wharf, or upon the decks of the same or contiguous ships with foreigners, must sell as cheap as they do, or not sell at all. If they sell as cheap, then it follows they must work as cheap, for a shilling, ninepence, sixpence, or less, by the day. And if they are obliged to work as cheap as they do, then, of necessity, they must live as cheap as they do. Now, sir, to say nothing of feeding our people as they are fed, clothing them as they are clothed, sheltering them as they are sheltered—what, let me ask you, is to become of our common schools—the nurseries of freemen—the only nurseries which Providence, in its infinite benignity, has vouchsafed to us ? What is to ring the bell of the village church, or keep the candle burning upon the altar of either religion or liberty ? What is to become of an educated, intelligent, virtuous yeomanry—the glory of our land—the glory of any land—the only basis upon which a republican Government can stand an hour ? Gone, sir—gone forever—sunk to the low level of the deep degradation of the common labor of the world. Let it be remembered, that here the people are sovereign—they make the laws. There the people have little or no agency in the government—the throne only is seen, and a few stars revolving around it. Here the people must be educated, must be virtuous, or you have mistaken your Government. I tell you, sir, that all your free institutions, all you have that is worth the having, the last hope of freedom to the *common people*, the last bud of promise that springs from earth to *them*, are all deeply rooted, grounded in the protective system. And he who shall destroy it, will extinguish the last light that throws a glimmer along the pathway of labor, from the time when it takes up its burden until it lays it down upon the low bank by the side of the place where the weary will be at rest.

What is it that gives to a republican Government its value—its popular charm ? What is it that gives it its spirit-stirring and hope-inspiring influence ? That consecrates and enthrones it in the heart of the *common people* ? It is not merely that it protects the lives, but mainly that it protects the labor of the people, that with the fruits of it they may elevate and improve their own condition and character. For what is the government of Him who governs the world designed, but to elevate, refine, and improve the character of his people as tending to the glory of his own. Mr. President, your Constitution is nothing, the right of suffrage is nothing, the laws of liberty are nothing, all are nothing, but as great instrumentalities to this one end—the protection of the labor of the people, that they may enjoy the fruits of it, and with them improve their condition, and elevate and refine their character. And if this object be not accomplished, better by far live

under a government that imposes upon the people no responsibility, and exacts of them no care. Better be born a slave than made a slave. Better be a slave by a perpetual, irrevocable ordinance of law, than by the necessity of one's condition. Bring the labor of this country into direct contact and competition with the labor of other nations, you in effect transfer and install their people here, and you transfer and enslave our people there. You inevitably assimilate and equalize their condition, elevating to some extent, perhaps, the one, and debasing the other. You may as well attempt to keep the waters that lave our Atlantic seaboard upon a higher level than those which beat upon the continent of Europe or break upon the coral of India, as the people of this country, in contact and competition with the labor of Europe and Asia, permanently upon an higher basis than the laboring people of those countries are; or the water of one of two confluent rivers upon an higher level than the other, while they flow on together until they are merged in the great deep.

Mr. President, it may be worth a wise man's consideration, how long this downward tendency of things would be endured by the freemen of this country. They are most of them laboring men upon the farm, or in the workshop, or in some form of service. One of these men sees his wages becoming less and less and less every day; his food becoming poorer and poorer and poorer every day; the clothes of his wife and children growing thinner and thinner and thinner every day. With no means to send his children to school, and no school to send them to—these young beings, destined to immortality—stars to shine forever, or to be quenched in the “outer darkness”—their destiny eminently depending upon him and his. How long, think you, Mr. President, this would be endured? The people of this country have drunk deeply at the fountains which their fathers opened for them—the wells of Jacob—the sweet waters of life—of the life of liberty. How long, I ask you, sir, would this be endured! I will not answer. I will only say, if they permit such a night of darkness as I have contemplated to set in upon them, it will be a night to which no morning, no sweet morning of liberty, will ever succeed for *them*.

Mr. President, I was delighted to hear the Senator from South Carolina say, that they at the South could rival the North in manufactures. “We have steam, he said, and water power, and every advantage. The Southern negro is much more efficient than the Mexican, and ten times more than the East Indian. Slave labor is the cheapest labor in the world. You of the North, if you cannot bear a competition with the free labor of England, much less can you with the slave labor of the South.” I did not know but there was some moral or physical obstacle in the way of it at the South. I rejoice to *know* it is otherwise. But in what position does this admission put the South? The South has a monopoly of the cotton crop, which is interdicted to us by our climate. The South can excel us in manufacture. And yet, the South quarrels with us for doing that which is all we can do, or for desiring the means which only will enable us to do even that. The South has the option of two ways, both better for it than for us; and yet quarrels with us that we take either, when we can only take but one.

Slave labor, he says, is the cheapest labor in the world, and we cannot compete with it. If the people were to be reared as slaves are reared, educated as slaves are educated, and worked as slaves are worked, under the impulses of an overseer, perhaps we might compete with it, for we should then be slaves ourselves. But if it depends upon this condition, perhaps,

we never shall. No, sir; if we are to be reared as slaves are reared in order to do it, perhaps we never shall *desire* it. No, sir, no. "Come one, come all," we never will.

Mr. President, I wish to avail myself of this occasion to disabuse the public mind, by stating what it is which the friends of the protective system desire. It is not that you raise a dollar more money than is needed for a wise, economical administration of this Government, but that you derive it from impost duties as far as you can; and, in doing it, that you discriminate, so as to protect the labor of your own country: the farmer in his wool, in his wheat, in his hemp, and in all the products of his farm; the planter in his cane, cotton, rice, and tobacco; the mechanic and the manufacturer in the fruits of their industry and skill. This is all that is asked, and all that is needed. To the consumer, who, if any body beside the importing merchant, pays the duty, it will make no difference. When a given amount of money is required, whether it be raised upon one article, or upon one hundred articles, it is in effect the same. He may as well pay a dollar in the gross as in parts. Not that I have the least doubt of the power of this Government to prohibit the importation of whatever the interests of commerce or the general welfare require. The mother country, in our colonial state, had the power to "regulate commerce;" in virtue of which the colonies conceded to her the power as well to impose duties on imports for the *regulation of trade*, as the power to prescribe what articles might be imported, in what vessels, and from what countries. The colonies each had the power to raise *revenue* by impost duties, which power was exercised for *protection* then as now. Both powers, well defined by long usage, and well understood, were, after the Revolution, in all their amplitude, granted to this Government by the people of the States. And they were granted expressly because the States, acting separately, could not exercise them uniformly, and therefore effectively for the whole. The grants stand in the Constitution as the power "To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, (in order) to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States;" and as the power "To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes." *Commerce*, as here used—the commerce of the *Constitution*—includes not merely navigation or the shipping interest, not merely the instruments, but all the subjects and means of commerce, external and internal, except only within the limits of each State. And as no small share of the revenue derived from impost duties is virtually paid by the foreign producer in the reduced price at which he is thereby obliged to sell, and some approach to an indemnity is thereby made for more than an hundred million of dollars, which foreign nations levy upon our exports, the system of deriving revenue from imports strongly commends itself to the country. I repeat, sir, raise no more money than you need: not one dollar more; but in raising it protect and favor the industry of the people. This is all that is asked. And if Congress has not the power to do this—the power to protect the means by which we live, as well as life itself—the Constitution is a thing not worth having.

Mr. President, I will make one other remark, and detain the Senate no longer. The unmitigated, unbrotherly hostility of some portions of the South, a system which has become vital to the North, and which, so far as my State at least is concerned, was imposed originally without her consent, and against her vote, has done more towards begetting a reciprocal feeling, of which there is so much complaint, and which is the source of so much discomfort, and of so much regret, than all other causes combined. Kindness begets kindness; hostility, the reverse. "Be to her faults a little blind, be to her virtues very kind," is a piece of homely matrimonial advice, upon which, if the States of this Union would act towards each other, our national as well as our family jars would soon come to an end, much to the happiness and good of all.